

Remarks

Claim Objections

Claims 32, 35 and 39 are objected to because they improperly attempt to incorporate claimed subject matter from preceding claims. The Examiner notes that these claims will be treated as independent claims, and that claims 35 and 39 are method claims, which improperly depend on limitations in an apparatus claim. Claims 32, 35 and 39 are amended to become independent claims, which overcomes the rejection. An additional independent claim fee for one claim over three is paid herewith.

Claim Rejections Under 35 USC 102

Claims 21-23, 25-26, 29-31, and 35-38 are rejected under 35 USC 102 as being anticipated by Buhring.

Valid rejection under 35 USC 102 requires that each feature of a rejected claim be disclosed in a single reference. "For anticipation under 35 USC 102, the reference must teach every aspect of the claimed invention either explicitly or impliedly. Any feature not directly taught must be inherently present." MPEP 706.02(a).

Applicant respectfully cannot concur, or follow the Examiner's opinion. **Applicant respectfully maintains that Buhring does not show units which are connected with the power supply in line.**

The passage cited by the Examiner relates to the **circuit of a single separation unit**, explicitly shown in Fig. 13. The single modules are, rather, connected parallel, as shown in Fig. 1.

The function of a separation unit might be similar, but the object of the present invention relates to the localization of a short circuit. Buhring does not give any hint to this object of the present invention.

Further, according to Applicant's understanding, the subject matter of the independent claims seems to be clear with respect to the electrical connection of the modules with respect to the power supply.

Claim Rejections Under 35 USC 103

Claim 27 is rejected as being unpatentable over Buhring in view of Ying.

Ying relates to a data transfer by switching the data stream to several bus lines. Ying has nothing in common with a switchable power supply. Accordingly, the present invention would not have been obvious to someone skilled in the art in view of Ying.

Claims 32-33 are rejected as being unpatentable over Buhring in view of Prendel. Claims 34 and 39-40 are rejected as being unpatentable over Buhring in view of Prendel and in further view of the EN 50254 standard.

Claims 41 and 42 are rejected as being unpatentable over Buhring, Prendel, and the EN 50254 standard, in further view of Ying.

The subject matter of claims 32, 33, 34 and 39-40, 41 and 42 are, respectfully, novel due to the fact that the independent claims are new in relation to the cited art.

This Amendment after Final Action is necessary to place the claims in condition for allowance or better condition for appeal.

A Petition for a three month extension of time in which to respond to the outstanding Office Action is requested, and a RCE are submitted herewith, as well as a fee for one independent claim over three, as set forth in the enclosed Petition and RCE.

Wherefore further consideration and allowance of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



M. Robert Kestenbaum
Reg. No. 20,430
11011 Bermuda Dunes NE
Albuquerque, NM USA 87111
Telephone (505) 323-0771
Facsimile (505) 323-0865

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING BY FIRST CLASS MAIL

I hereby certify under 37 CFR §1.8(a) that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail with sufficient postage on the date indicated below and is addressed to the Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on 03/06/2007.



M. Robert Kestenbaum